

No. 10279-4Lab-75/29274.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s S. Mohan and Company opposite Super Seals India (P) Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 239 of 1971  
between

SMT. SUNDRI AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S S. MOHAN & COMPANY OPP. SUPER  
SEALS INDIA (P) LTD., FARIDABAD.

Present :—

Shri Roshan Lal Sharma, for the worker.  
Nemo, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/187-B-71/35406—11, dated 29th November, 1971, of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s S. Mohan & Company Opposite Super Seals India (P) Ltd., Faridabad and its worker Smt. Sundri was referred for adjudication to this court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

“Whether the termination of services of Shrimati Sundri was justified and in order? If not, to what relief she is entitled?”

Usual notices of the reference having been sent for services of the parties, the management did not appear on 9th April, 1974, even after service of the notice on them. *Ex parte* proceedings were, therefore, taken up against them on that date.

The worker was directed to adduce her *ex parte* evidence in support of the demand raised by her. Her authorised representative made a statement that the worker proposed to withdraw the demand made on the management and had as such now no dispute.

It would appear in view of the statement of the authorised representative of the worker that there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I thus return a no dispute award with no order as to costs:

Dated, the 25th August, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 2159, dated the 1st September, 1975.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana  
Rohtak.

No. 10235-4Lab-75/29276.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Vijay Shree Commercial Industries Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT HARYANA,  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 220 of 1972  
between

SHRI NIRANJAN PAL SINGH AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S VIJAY SHREE COMMERCIAL  
INDUSTRIES FARIDABAD

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/72/33314-18 dated 1st September, 1972 of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s Vijay Shree Commercial Industries, Faridabad and its workmen Shri Nirajan Pal Singh was referred for adjudication to this court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Nirajan Pal Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

Usual notices of the reference being sent to the parties vide,—registered letter, directing them to appear before the Labour Court, a report dated 19th April, 1974 was received that the respondent firm was found closed and that the workman had left his residence without address was received subsequently. Another report dated 27th September, 1974 that the workman left without address. Still another report was received on 23rd May, 1975 that the workman was not found available on the address as supplied by him. Reports had also been received from time to time that the office and the premises of the management was found closed.

The registered letter sent to the workman with a notice for his appearance today, has been duly received after service of the workman through some of his family member. The workman is absent despite service of the notice of the reference.

It would appear from the res me of the case as stated above, that neither the workman nor the management has cared to appear since 18th October, 1972 the date of receipt of the reference, thereby indicating that they are not interested in pursuing the case and the workman is not interested in the demand raised by him on respondent.

I, therefore, hold that there is no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I accordingly return a no dispute award with no order as to costs.

Dated the 26th August, 1975

MOHAN LAL JAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 2156, dated 1st September, 1975.

Forwarded (fourcopies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana Rohtak.

No. 10237-4Lab-75/29278.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Vijay Shree Commercial (P) Ltd., Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 65 of 1972

between

SHRI RAMESH CHAND AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S VIJAY SHREE COMMERCIAL  
(P) LTD., FARIDABAD

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/740-D-71/5929, dated 18th February, 1972, of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management, of M/s Vijay Shree Commercial (P) Ltd., Faridabad and its workman Shri Ramesh Chander was referred for adjudication to this court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947;—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Ramesh Chander was justified and in order?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

Usual notices of the reference being issued for service on the parties. None appeared for the management before me.

Shri Roshan Lal Sharma authorised representative of the workman is present before me today and has made a statement that he has no instructions from the workman in this reference. This means that the workman is not interested in the demand raised by him on the management.

I, therefore, hold that there is no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I, as such, return a no dispute award with no order as to costs.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana  
Rohtak.

Dated 26th August, 1975.